



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,024	09/02/2003	Gregg M. Duthaler	H-357	2023

26245 7590 01/26/2006

DAVID J COLE  
E INK CORPORATION  
733 CONCORD AVE  
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138-1002

EXAMINER

THOMAS, BRANDI N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2873

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/605,024

Applicant(s)

DUTHALER ET AL.

Examiner

Brandi N. Thomas

Art Unit

2873

RM

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Response filed 10/28/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 17-27 and 33-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 23-27 and 41-44 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 17-22, 33-37, 39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>Detailed Action</u> .      |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Double Patenting***

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claim 17 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 23 of copending Application No.

10/708,121. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Claim 17, of application 10/605,024, and claim 23, of application 10/708,121, include the same claimed subject matter.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 21, 22, 37, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Webber et al. (2004/0252360 A1).

Regarding claim 21, Webber et al. discloses, in figure 2, an article of manufacture comprising: a layer of solid electro-optic medium (302) having a first and second surfaces on opposed sides thereof (section 0063); a first release sheet (300) covering the first surface of the layer of solid electro-optic medium (section 0063); and a second release sheet (314) covering the second surface of the layer of solid electro-optic medium (302) (section 0063).

Regarding claims 22 and 37, Webber et al. discloses, in figure 1, an article of manufacture, wherein the electro-optic medium (130) is an electrophoretic medium comprising a plurality of capsules (140) (section 0059), each capsule (140) comprising a suspending fluid (165) (section 0059), a plurality of electrically charged particles (150 and 160) suspended in the suspending fluid (165) and capable of moving therethrough on application an electric field to the suspending fluid (165) (sections 0059 and 0069), and a capsule wall surrounding the suspending fluid (165) and the electrically charged particles (150 and 160) (section 0059).

Art Unit: 2873

Regarding claim 39, Webber et al. discloses, in figure 1, an article of manufacture, wherein the suspending fluid (165) and the plurality of electrically charged particles (150 and 160) are retained within a plurality of cavities formed in a carrier medium (section 0059).

Regarding claim 40, Webber et al. discloses, in figure 1, an article of manufacture, wherein the electro-optic medium (130) is a rotating bichromal member medium of an electrochromic medium (section 0031).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

5. Claims 23-27 and 41-44 are allowed.
6. Claim 38 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. The prior art taken either singularly or in combination fails to anticipate or fairly suggest the limitations of the independent claim(s), in such a manner that a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103 would be proper. The prior art fails to teach a combination of all the claimed features as presented in claim(s) 23-27, 38, and 41-44, wherein the claimed invention comprises laminating the article to a front substrate via the second adhesive layer and removing the release sheet from the front subassembly and laminating the front subassembly via the first adhesive layer to a backplane comprising at least one electrode; and wherein the suspending fluid and the plurality of charged particles are present as a plurality of discrete droplets and a continuous phase of polymeric material surrounds the droplets, as claimed.

Art Unit: 2873

*Response to Arguments*

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 17-27 and 33-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandi N. Thomas whose telephone number is 571-272-2341. The examiner can normally be reached on 7- 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Mack can be reached on 571-272-2333. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BNT

BNT  
December 29, 2005

  
RICKY MACK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER